(c) No, Sir, In fact, the guidelines and regulations on conservation of bio-diversity will ensure sustainable development and supply of medicinal plants for health care of the people, the majority of whom have been following traditional methods of health care.

**Steps to reduce urban poverty**

*450. SHRIS. ANBALAGAN: Will the Minister of HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION be pleased to state:

the number of below poverty line (BPL) people living in the urban areas of the country at present, State-wise;

the percentage of BPL people in the total population of urban areas, State-wise;

the reasons for continuous poverty of large number of people despite the schemes of the Union Government to improve their lives; and

the concrete steps proposed to be taken by the Union Government to reduce the increasing urban poverty in the country?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION (KUMARI SELJA): (a) and (b) Planning Commission release estimates of urban poor from time to time based on the national sample surveys conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO). The National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) has conducted the latest large sample survey on household consumer expenditure (61st Round), covering the period July 2004 to June 2005. From this data, two different consumption distributions for the year 2004-05 have been obtained. The first one is from the consumption data collected using 30-day recall period for all the items. The other distribution is obtained from the consumer expenditure data collected using 365-day recall period for five infrequently purchased non-food items, namely clothing, footwear, durable goods, educations and institutional medical expenses and 30-day recall period for the remaining items. These two consumption distribution have been termed as Uniform Recall Period (URP) consumption distribution and Mixed Recall Period (MRP) consumption distribution respectively. The Planning Commission has estimated poverty in 2004-05 using both the distributions. As per these estimates, number and percentage of urban poor both by MRP method as well as URP method, State-wise, are at the Statement(See below).

The reasons for continuous poverty in large number of cities and towns include various factors such as natural increase in the urban poor population, migration of poor people from rural areas to urban areas, lack of basic amenities including affordable housing to low income segments, inadequate employment opportunities generated by the organized sector etc. Moreover, budgetary allocations under various governmental schemes, till the launching of Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) in December, 2005, have been meagre.

The Government of India has adopted a two pronged approach to address the issue of increasing urban poverty in the country:

(i) A large component of Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) namely Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP), applicable to 63 identified cities and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP), applicable to other cities and towns, provide additional central assistance

for construction of houses and provision of basic amenities to the urban poor. A sum of Rs. 18,100 crores has been allocated for the Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP) and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (1HSDP) components for the Mission period (2005-2012). Further, emphasis is placed under JNNURM on reforms at State and urban local body levels to ensure provisions of land for affordable housing, earmarking of municiple budget for the urban poor and time-bound programme for provisions of seven basic amenities.

(ii) The allocation under Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY)—a programme under which provision is made for self-employment through setting up of micro-enterprises by individuals as well as women groups; wage employment to the urban poor through creation of socially and economically useful public assets; skill upgradation training; and community empowerment for facilitating the organisation of the urban poor—has been increased substantially from Rs. 160 crore in 2005-2006 to Rs. 250 crore in 2006-2007, Rs. 344 crore in 2007-2008 and Rs. 515 crore in 2008-09.

***Statement***

*State-wise number and percentage of population below poverty line in urban areas* (2004-05) *(Based on URP and MRP-Consumption)*

| SI. No. | States/UTs | By URP Method | | By MRP Method | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % age of persons | No. of persons (lakhs) | % age of persons | No. of persons (lakhs) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 28.00 | 61.40 | 20.70 | 45.50 |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | 3.30 | 0.09 | 2.40 | 0.07 |
| 3 | Assam | 3.30 | 1.28 | 2.40 | 0.93 |
| 4 | Bihar | 34.60 | 32.42 | 28.90 | 27.09 |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 41.20 | 19.47 | 34.70 | 16.39 |
| 6 | Delhi | 15.20 | 22.30 | 10.80 | 15.83 |
| 7 | Goa | 21.30 | 1.64 | 20.90 | 1.62 |
| 8 | Gujarat | 13.00 | 27.19 | 10.10 | 21.18 |
| 9 | Haryana | 15.10 | 10.60 | 11.30 | 7.99 |
| 10 | Himachal Pradesh | 3.40 | 0.22 | 2.60 | 0.17 |
| 11 | Jammu & Kashmir | 7.90 | 2.19 | 8.50 | 2.34 |
| 12 | Jharkhand | 20.20 | 13.20 | 16.30 | 10.63 |
| 13 | Karnataka | 32.60 | 63.83 | 27.20 | 53.28 |
| 14 | Kerala | 20.20 | 17.17 | 16.40 | 13.92 |
| 15 | Madhya Pradesh | 42.10 | 74.03 | 39.30 | 68.97 |
| 16 | Maharashtra | 32.20 | 146.25 | 29.00 | 131.40 |
| 17 | Manipur | 3.30 | 0.20 | 2.40 | 0.14 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Meghalaya | 3.30 | 0.16 | 2.40 | 0.12 |
| 19 | Mizoram | 3.30 | 0.16 | 2.40 | 0.11 |
| 20 | Nagaland | 3.30 | 0.12 | 2.40 | 0.09 |
| 21 | Orissa | 44.30 | 26.74 | 40.30 | 24.30 |
| 22 | Punjab | 7.10 | 6.50 | 3.80 | 3.52 |
| 23 | Rajasthan | 32.90 | 47.51 | 28.10 | 40.50 |
| 24 | Sikkim | 3.30 | 0.02 | 2.40 | 0.02 |
| 25 | Tamil Nadu | 22.20 | 69.13 | 18.80 | 58.59 |
| 26 | Tripura | 3.30 | 0.20 | 2.40 | 0.14 |
| 27 | Uttar Pradesh | 30.60 | 117.03 | 26.30 | 100.47 |
| 28 | Uttarakhand | 36.50 | 8.85 | 32.00 | 7.75 |
| 29 | West Bengal | 14.80 | 35.14 | 11.20 | 26.64 |
| 30 | A & N Islands | 22.20 | 0.32 | 18.80 | 0.27 |
| 31 | Chandigarh | 7.10 | 0.67 | 3.80 | 0.36 |
| 32 | Dadra & Nagar Haveli | 19.10 | 0.15 | 19.20 | 0.16 |
| 33 | Daman & Diu | 21.20 | 0.14 | 20.80 | 0.14 |
| 34 | Lakshadweep | 20.20 | 0.06 | 16.40 | 0.05 |
| 35 | Pondicherry | 22.20 | 1.59 | 18.80 | 1.34 |
| | | 25.70 | 807.96 | 21.70 | 682.02 |

NOTE:

1. Poverty Ratio of Assam is used for Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland and Tripura.
2. Poverty Line of Maharashtra and expenditure distribution of Goa is used to estimate poverty ratio of Goa.
3 Poverty Ratio of Tamil Nadu is used for Pondicherry and A&N Islands.
4. Urban Poverty Ratio of Punjab used for both rural and urban poverty of Chandigarh 5 Poverty Line of Maharashtra and expenditure distribution of Dadra & Nagar Haveli is used to estimate poverty ratio of Dadra & Nagar Haveli.
5 Poverty Ratio of Goa is used for Daman & Diu.
6. Poverty Ratio of Kerala is used for Lakshadweep.

**Funds for maintenance of NH-54**

*451. SHR1 LALHMING LIANA: Will the Minister of SHIPPING, ROAD" TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS be pleased to state:

the amount of funds allocated for maintenance of NH-54 during the last three financial years;

whether the funds allocated for maintenance of NH-54 have not been utilized at all; and

if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): (a) to (c) The funds allocated and utilized for maintenance of NH-54 during the last three financial years are given below: